
Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 02:14:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:A little off topic, but these same "weapons of terror" (however those "experts" want to define it) are probably what kept the United States and Russia from blasting each other. It pertains no relevance to Saddam, but condemning the same weapons (or at least having that kind of connotation) that probably saved all of our lives seems a bit strange.

The fear of those weapons was what made them the most useful, I agree. Mutually assured destruction. However, there are enough of the damn things around already to wipe out all life on Earth several times over, and IMHO it is far better to have any existing weapons in the hands of countries which are not willing to use them(or lose them!).

Quote:I'm curious, could you get some proof about those MRBMs? It's not that I don't believe you, it's just I would prefer to have some confirmation.

I had been watching live news reports of the invasion when the SCUDs first came up- IIRC, Saddam's troops fired on Kuwait with them from well inside the Iraqi border. I'm pretty sure it was CNN I was watching- if I have the time tomorrow, I'll try to find a write-up of the story. In case you get around to looking before I do, the event took place within about 12-24 hours of the beginning of the invasion.

Quote:Well, it's equally arguable to say the same thing to the intelligence communities that screwed up, right?

The intelligence community DID screw up. The director of the CIA lost his job over it- officially he resigned for "personal reasons," however it is well known that all government officials hand the President signed (but undated) resignation letters before taking office. They do that so the administration can fire any person at any time without looking bad for it.

Quote:I sincerely hope you haven't concluded that France and opposers to the war were in it for personal gain only. If you have, then I'm sorry to say but you are wrong. It might surprise you, but other people have principles as well, and they don't always revolve around money. Canada did not send their troops to Iraq, but we thus far have given over \$300,000,000 to the Iraqi people for humanitarian reasons since this war began. We gain nothing from Saddam being in power, and risk quite a lot by not supporting one of our closest allies in their unlawful invasion.

Sad as it may be, no country makes decisions of that significance without there being some gain in it for them. That includes France, the US, and everyone else as well. Morality may play some part, but it is the money and security that really drive such choices.

Quote:You said "at the time". With Saddam out of power, and any influx of funds going to France because of Saddam (as so many people seem to believe) stopped, why aren't the French, in full force assisting in Iraq now (I'm NOT referring to the humanitarian efforts of the United Nations, btw)? Why isn't Canada? Why isn't Russia?

Simple. With Saddam gone, there is no money to be made. Sending troops would do nothing to

augment the country's income or security- and assisting the insurgents would only ruin the already shaky US-France or US-Russia alliances.

Quote:I love the argument about how Saddam was going to attack us all with WMDs. You do realise that an ICBM needs to have satellite targeting don't you? How many satellites do you think Saddam had? WMDs were never an issue to us, only to Kuwait, Iran and Saudi Arabia, all of whom happen to be about as much interest to the northern hemisphere as the oil they produce....

You, sir, need to read more. Or watch more TV. Or do something- your information is inadequate at best.

*First-An ICBM does not *need* to be targeted at all- it could be purchased having already been configured by someone else. The missile guides itself, and needs no outside assistance once launched.

*Second- We aren't talking about ICBM's(InterContinental Ballistic Missiles), we're talking about MRBM's(Medium Range Ballistic Missiles). Biiig difference. Most ICBM's go all the way up into Earth orbit before hitting their targets, while an MRBM(such as a SCUD launcher) may only reach as high as the Stratosphere- around cruising altitude for commercial jetliners.

I won't even answer the part about oil, since this war never had anything to do with oil in the first place- a fact which has been established time and time again.
